

## II. Remarks

Reconsideration and re-examination of this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is herein respectfully requested.

### *Allowable Subject Matter*

The undersigned acknowledges the Examiner's indication of the allowability of claims 4 and 10, if the 35 U.S.C. §112 rejection to claims 4 and 10 are overcome. However, no rejection to claims 4 and 10 were set forth in the Office Action and the Office Action summary indicates that claim 4 and 10 are only objected to by the Examiner, and not rejected. Therefore, the limitations of claim 4 have been incorporated into claim 1 and the limitations of claim 10 have been incorporated into claim 9. Accordingly, claims 4 and 10 have been cancelled.

### *Claim Objections*

Claim 1 has been amended to use lower case letters for the first letter of each step.

Claims 3 and 8 were objected to as being duplicate claims. Accordingly, claim 8 has been cancelled. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objections to claims 1, 3, and 8.



BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE  
PO Box 10395  
Chicago, IL 60611-5599

*Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102(e)*

Claims 1, 3, 6-9, 12, 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by US-2001/0003443 to Velazquez et al. (Velazquez).

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 4, previously indicated by the Examiner to include allowable subject matter. Further, claim 9 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 10, previously indicated by the Examiner to include allowable subject matter. Claims 3, 6, 7, 8, 14, 14, and 15 depend directly or indirectly from claims 1 or 9, and are therefore patentable for at least the reasons given above in support of claims 1 and 9. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102.

*Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103(a)*

Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Velazquez in view of U.S. 4,688,092 to Kamel et al. (Kamel).

Claim 2 depends directly from claim 1 and is therefore patentable for at least the reasons given above in support of claim 1.

Claims 5 and b were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Velazquez.

Claims 5 and 13 depend directly from claims 1 and 9 respectively, and are therefore patentable for at least the reasons given above in support of claims 1 and 9.



BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE  
PO Box 10395  
Chicago, IL 60611-5599

Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Velazquez in view of U.S. 5,027,302 to Asanuma et al. (Asanuma).


Claim 11 depends directly from claim 9 and is patentable for at least the reasons given above in support of claim 9. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103.

*Conclusion*

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present form of the claims are patentably distinguishable over the art of record and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted by,

Dated: December 16, 2004

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Robert K. Fergan  
Reg. No.: 51,674  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE  
P.O. Box 10395  
Chicago, IL 60610  
(734) 302-6000



BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE  
PO Box 10395  
Chicago, IL 60611-5599